The MINISTER'S QUARTERLY

Continuing The Seminar Quarterly

VOLUME V: No. 1 FEBRUARY, 1949

Issued in the Interest of Christian Worship and Preaching

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Gaius Glenn Atkins, D.D., L.H.D.
Editor

V.5
1949

Published quarterly by
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE MINISTRY
THE CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES
287 Fourth Avenue New York 10, N. Y.

SINGLE COPIES 15 CENTS. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION 50 CENTS per year

Entered as second-class matter March 2, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under Act of March 3, 1879

THE MINISTER'S QUARTERLY

Contents Vol. V, No. 1

PAGE

I. *Preaching with Passion* 3
THE REV. BINNEY SIMPSON BLACK, B.A., B.D.

II. *Greetings from the New Director of the Department of the Ministry* 5
THE REV. FRED SHERMAN BUSCHMEYER

III. *Why A Church?* 7
THE REV. HERMAN J. WELLS, P.E.

IV. *"Come Unto Me," Said the Master* 10
THE REV. SAMUEL LAWRENCE JOHNSON

V. *"Jesus, Friend, So Kind and Gentle"* . . . 15
THE REV. PHILIP E. GREGORY

VI. *The Puritan Theocracy and the Cambridge Platform* 16
ADDRESS BY PROFESSOR ROLAND H. BAINTON

VII. *Behind the Mirror* 22
THE EDITOR

VIII. *Freedom and Responsibility* 26
THE REV. RICHARD W. INGLE, B.D.

IX. *Prayers* 29
THE REV. JOSEPH LYLE MCCORISON, S.T.D.

X. *The Rehabilitation of "Everyman"* 31
THE REV. WILLIAM R. STEININGER

All rights reserved

The Department of the Ministry is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.

All communications relating to subscriptions should be addressed to the office of The General Council, Room 915, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor: Dr. G. G. Atkins, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance. Till further notice address all communications to Editor, c/o Council office.

Preaching with Passion

The Rev. Binney Simpson Black, B.A., B.D.
Toronto, Ontario

IT does us preachers good at times to preach to ourselves and seek to enforce some precept or practice in which we may be deficient, and which indeed may be a common defect among the members of our calling. The preacher of today needs to study every aspect of the preaching art if he hopes ever to become "a workman who has no need to be ashamed," an effective and powerful preacher of the everlasting Gospel. But it follows as the night the day that there are certain great foundation principles to be observed by every prophet of God if his work in the pulpit is to convince, convict, and convert, and fulfill the great ends of preaching—to persuade men and women to submit their hearts and minds to Christ, that in union with Him they may find peace and joy, and guidance in all the relationships of life.

There are many requirements for such preaching. Some of these will occur at once to every thoughtful person who holds the ministry in high repute. A man must be sincere, he must have a Christian experience, a knowledge of the Bible and of men, humility, sympathy, good sense, and an academic training. But a good deal of modern preaching, we believe, often fails for one particular reason; and it is this one thing we wish to single out and come to grips with as being a prime essential in all effective pulpit ministry. What the pulpit lacks so often is an earnestness that glows, that reaches white heat, that presents the claims of Christ with moving conviction, fervor, persuasiveness, with that divine passion which characterized the great preachers of an earlier day, like Whitefield and Wesley, Spurgeon, Finney, and Moody. It would be well for all of us who aspire to preaching excellence to study the careers of the best representatives of sacred discourse. We would discover that the men who have moved their hearers and won them to the higher life have not depended on the force of the truths they uttered, their apt illustrations, finished sentences, array of arguments, rare fluency of speech. They may have been possessed of all of these and yet not win an attentive ear and the heart's best welcome. Even great truths, though clothed in golden speech may languish on our tongues. For lack of what?

The power of burning conviction. This is indispensable, and it springs from a deep and overpowering love for God and men. Without this glowing ardor the sermons of the great distinguished preachers, and of the many less known but mightily used of God, would have failed to produce the impression they did. Hearts are not moved by the grand style alone, nor by any other devices or preaching strategies, unless the speech be molten. Dr. Cadman somewhere wrote: "Without vibrant passion speech is dead." Logic has its place, but logic that is not on fire will never evoke responsive chords, and bring the hearer to the place where he exclaims, "What must I do to be saved?" Where there is no overflow of soul, no burning intensity, and an unimpassioned proclamation of the manifold grace of God, sinners will never be brought to repentance and faith in the Son of God and to a life of loving obedience to His holy will.

I

After all, this is the central thing, the supreme objective. What is it that a preacher should be seeking to do, first, last, and all the time? Surely to lead his

hearers into a real *experience* of God. But there is a heresy which has come down the stream of time and has spread everywhere: that religion is a matter of accepting a creed, where belief in doctrinal statements takes the place of spiritual experience. Beliefs are necessary, to be sure, for as you cannot have an oak without an acorn, or a body without bones, so you cannot have the beautiful fruitage of Christian character without the vital beliefs of the Gospel. The pivotal doctrines or foundation truths of the Evangel of Jesus must be preached in all their purity and power, for from that root grow grace and truth and Christian character and conduct. The preacher must address himself to the intellect as well as to the heart, to the reason as well as to the conscience. But whatever way men and women are reached, whether head first or heart first, the fact remains that the essence of religion is an experience and some conscious communion with the spirit and life of God, and not the mere mental assent to doctrinal affirmations. For what does not fall within our experience can have but little if any meaning for us. Religion is life, or else it is only a thing to which we pay lip-service.

To produce the true Christian experience, then, the preacher must be so enwrapped with his message that people will go away saying, "Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked to us?" If the sermon is just wooden, lacking in animation, with no other sign of earnestness than occasional loud tones and forceful gestures, it will not be "the power of God for salvation." The preaching that is likely to get the desired results cannot be entirely without emotion, an emotion that is Spirit-wrought and Spirit-controlled, and therefore far removed from anything artificial, emotion that is caused by the eager longing in the preacher's heart to bring men to spiritual decision through the power of the Holy Spirit. As Augustine said truly, "One loving spirit sets another on fire." Such a pure ambition will give us in the pulpit not the essayist whose style is academic, but the preacher whose power is Pentecostal.

Increasingly it is burned into one's consciousness that the sermon needed today (is our day any different from other days?) is that which is characterized by the solemn urgency that the matters brought to the people's attention shall be "spirit and life" to them. If the man in the pulpit gives no impression that his passion is for souls, that he is bent on serious business, he will have no souls for his hire.

In *The Preacher: His Life and Work,* Dr. J. H. Jowett said emphatically that "in all our preaching we must preach for verdicts . . . and we must ask for immediate execution of the verdict." In those Yale Lectures that prince of preachers also wrote that people may say "What a fine sermon!" instead of "What a great God!" They may say, "What a ready speaker!" rather than "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!" Dr. Jowett is outspoken as to *how* the right impression is to be achieved. We must avoid what he calls a "cold officialism," of mind and heart, where the words are only words. How true this is! Our words must be so related to the most important of all subjects, and so inspired by the Spirit of God, that they will sway our own feelings and make us genuine ambassadors for Christ, God making His appeal through us. "Therefore, knowing the fear of the Lord, we persuade men." And how can any man who deals with life-and-death realities ever talk about them in a lifeless way? If "the burden of souls" is upon our hearts we will beseech men in living and earnest and melting tones not to receive the grace of God in vain. We shall feel with the great St. Paul, "Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel." Dr. C. E. Jefferson in that priceless book of his, *The Building of the Church,* wrote this: "A preacher dies in the act of preaching. He lays down his life for his brethren. . . . The pulpit is a Golgotha in which the preacher gives his life for the life of the world."

Some sermons, it is true, do not give the same scope for flaming zeal as other sermons do that are a call to the careless and indifferent to seek the Lord while He may be found. There are lines of thought which necessarily proceed in a quieter way and do not call for that intensity of speech and manner which reveals the emotion of the preacher's heart. Yet even in more subdued discourse it will be impossible to conceal what the preacher himself believes, and that behind his every thought and word there lies an inner experience of depth and power and a yearning desire to have others share it. Any other kind of sermon will be "a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal."

No, we cannot deal in abstract fashion or in an unimpassioned way with the momentous truths of our Christian faith. There must be an evangelical passion which is never allowed to flag. Every minister needs at times to review his ordination vows. Dr. James Moffatt somewhere referred to the ordination service for the Scottish ministry, with the awe and hush of the congregation, and the heart-searching of the young ordinand as the question is put to him: "Are zeal for the glory of God, love to the Lord Jesus Christ, and a desire for the salvation of men, so far as you know your own heart, your great motives and chief inducements to enter into the office of the Holy Ministry?" Every minister should have these solemn, searching words written on the fleshly tables of his heart, and might to the greatest advantage rehearse them during those precious, prayerful, and preparatory moments just prior to his entering the pulpit. It would save him from any selfish ambition which cuts the nerve of spiritual power, and would make him a humble, dedicated servant of the high and holy purposes of God. Seeing in every man "the brother for whom Christ died," with a passion for his salvation, unbounded faith in the Gospel, the conviction that at every service in the church eternal issues are at stake, and believing himself "an apostle by the will of God," the preacher will preach with passion and power. Hearts of stone will begin to beat, souls will be "born anew," and men will go out from the temple to glorify God in lives of holy love and service.

"O for a passionate passion for souls,
O for a pity that yearns,
O for a love that loves even to death,
O for a fire that burns!"

Greetings from the New Director of the Department of the Ministry

The Rev. Fred Sherman Buschmeyer
Associate Secretary of the General Council, New York

THESE few words are not written to constitute an "Article." They are set down with gratitude for the opportunity to say to the ministers of our fellowship what I have said already, in essence, to the members of the Commission on the Ministry.

It is with a great sense of humility that I shall try to take up the work of the Commission on the Ministry which has been so ably conceived and so devotedly carried on up to the present by Dr. Frederick L. Fagley. This is not the time or place even to attempt to outline the many wise steps by which he has laid the foundations for a full-fledged Department of

the Ministry in our fellowship. I merely wish to record the fact that, having had the privilege of watching the influence of his leadership, and of feeling the genuineness and warmth of his concern for the men of our ministry across more than twenty years, I am almost overcome both with the honor and the responsibility of trying to build upon his good foundations. It helps to know that he will not be far away, and that his counsel can still be had.

It helps, also, to know that James F. English, with whom I have wet many a fly while he caught many a fish, is continuing as the Chairman of the Commission. The wisdom of his years as both pastor of a local church and as a Superintendent of a State Conference will bring balance as well as insight and enthusiasm to the efforts of the whole Commission and its new director.

You have a right to know the slant of my mind and experience as I take up this new work, and I am eager to state that I come from (and am not at all eager to leave) over twenty years of service in local churches. This means that any bias that I bring with me is a bias which reflects a deep belief that the strength and genuine Christian influence of the local church is the focal point and hope of our fellowship.

Out of these years of work with Boards of Deacons, Trustees, and Education, I come to our Commission on the Ministry with the conviction that the best "professional strategy" is simply complete honesty and sharing of every hope and fear, as together we seek to find the best answer to the particular problem or concern. It is my understanding that the relationship of the director and the Commission will be very much like that of a Minister and his Board of Deacons, or his Advisory Council; only in this instance we are representing and trying to serve the interests of our whole ministerial fellowship.

I come to this expanded opportunity for the development of the Department of the Ministry believing that there is real strength in our local church leadership, and that our primary opportunity for improving and increasing the total impact of our ministry lies in helping to make articulate the aspirations and latent strengths of our local churches and their leaders.

It is my further conviction that we of the Congregational Christian ministry have a special opportunity and obligation to demonstrate the heights of professional standards and cooperative effectiveness which can be achieved without the rigidity of a strictly authoritarian system of ministerial training, placement and functioning. It seems to me that our obligation to demonstrate the best that can be achieved under our free system is made the more urgent because such a free system offers the most logical and psychological opportunity for our present differing denominations to get together in an ecumenical movement that will afford unity of fellowship and purpose without setting up unachievable requirements of exact uniformity in matters of both faith and practice.

I come to the work of the Commission with a special consciousness of how much the personal friendship and counselling of our General Council Ministers have meant to my own experience, particularly in the earlier years of my service. Out of this appreciation I shall do my best to be such a friend and counsellor, especially to the younger or newer members of our fellowship.

As to the specific fronts along which the Department of the Ministry may be expected to move forward, these will have to be decided upon and defined after the first of the year (this is written in November) when the officers of the Commission, the members of the joint staff (executives serving under various Boards or Departments, but whose work touches the recruiting, training, or fellowship and standards, of our ministry) and the new director shall sit down together for this very purpose. I am gratefully conscious of how much wisdom and experience will be brought to this future planning by both

the joint staff and the commission members. One particular point of emphasis has been called to my attention by many people; namely, the need for the director to spend a considerable amount of time in familiarizing our seminary students with our Congregational Christian fellowship and cooperative ways of working before they step out to take their first pastoral responsibilities. This single opportunity for increasing the fellowship and working effectiveness of each new generation of Congregational Christian ministers is something that makes my own heart quicken with anticipation and hope. But here, as in many other possible fronts for advance, I would wish to make it clear from the outset that I shall count heavily upon the cooperative interest and sharing of all the men in our ministry in those projects or areas of interest which lie closest to their hearts or to their fields of service. My basic hope and confidence lie in what we can achieve together.

Why a Church?

The Rev. Herman J. Wells, P.E.
Scituate, Mass.

BEING a minister, I notice the church buildings as I drive (or now go by train or bus) through countryside or village. A glimpse of a church gives me a homey feeling. I am somewhat lonesome, almost homesick if no church shows up among the passing structures. Does that emotion arise only in a minister's experience, or is it more—a valid human reaction? Is a community really destitute if lacking a church? If we have in mind a material structure of boards and a steeple, it can be answered that many a community does feel rather comfortable to be the owners of such a building, and that too even though it makes no use of it.

But we are not asking our question about a material building. We are speaking of an organization of human beings who own that material edifice; Why a church? Sir Stafford Cripps, a distinguished Englishman, in a speech before the Industrial Christian Fellowship of London in 1942, answers. "It is [he tells us] for the church to provide the moral force and driving power for social and economic development." He admits that the church knows neither the social organization nor the economic set-up that should be. It is only a "force—a driving power" to set up that which is suggested or proposed elsewhere.

That is rather confusing; certainly it is unsatisfactory; it is more than that; it is a wrong answer. There are other, many other, unsatisfactory answers. Is there a satisfactory one? There must be, for the church is here and will be here. Jesus said of it, "The gates of hell shall not succeed against it." It is founded on the everlasting rock and is an abiding institution in human society.

As it is Jesus' church, He alone can tell us what to expect of it. Why a church? Let us learn from Him the answer. His own mission to mankind is one of reconciliation. He came to bring men to God. On His departure from life here in the body He entrusted his mission to His church. Jesus said to His disciples, "As the Father sent me forth, I am sending you forth." The church is to carry forward His work in His name and spirit. To win men to a permanent relation of trust and love to God, the Father, was His mission and therefore that of His church. That is understood by His disciples and accepted. The world is saved through Jesus. All men are invited to be-

lieve in Him and follow Him as Lord and Master. What the church of today seems to overlook is the period after Master. For one who, on receiving the invitation, sends in "regrets" the matter remains closed until he changes his mind—repents. On the Mount Jesus said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God." Such seeking is not only of first importance; it is the first thing to be done. "The Son of man has come to seek and save," said Jesus. If that first step in response is not taken, there can be none to follow. The mission of the church to the world is to urge that step. As long as any man refuses the Savior, so long the church is powerless to help him. It is by his choice, not that of the Church, that nothing further can be done. Jesus clearly told His disciples, "Whosoever will not receive you, leave that town and shake off the very dust of your feet, in testimony against them." The father of the parable stood in untold sorrow as He watched His son deliberately disown that home and go off in search of one unlike it. The father did nothing to stop him. Neither God, nor Christ, nor the church can enter a life where they are not wanted. For the world, the church does one thing. It lifts up the Lord Jesus. And He, being such as He is, draws men to Himself.

To all men not of its fellowship, the church is like John the Baptist pointing to Jesus as man's Savior. Every activity, every plan, of the church that concerns such must be evaluated by its adaptation and success in thus presenting Jesus winningly to the world. Let the Salvation Army sound its trumpets on the street corner to call loiterers to hear about Jesus. Let the missionary show by manual labor how to get better crops from the soil, that in this way he wins men to himself and through him to his Savior. Let Y. M. C. A.'s gather youth in basketball games, under men who devote themselves in Christian love to guide boys and youth to Christ the Lord. Paul well expresses the work of the church in his own activities. "I have made myself the slave of all, *to win over as many as I can—to all men I have become all things to save some by all and every means.*" To win men to Christ by any means available is the *first* service the church is called upon to perform in behalf of a world that knows not the Master as Lord and Savior.

I

That the church has obligations to its members is clear, but that is another story; we have here considered only its relations to those not of its membership. It is in its attitude toward human society at large that the church is today making false moves. It is taking on business that belongs to other institutions. It is attempting to instruct the world about an order of society, about economics, organization of business and labor, political platforms and tariffs. The temporal concerns seem more attractive and important than evangelism. The Gospel of reconciliation that concerns his real life is thrust aside for concerns of man's material welfare. Jesus warns us not to be anxious about such; the church seems more anxious about them than about the kingdom. The treasure that the church should offer the world is real life—that of the heart, mind and will, not that which moth consumes and rust destroys and thieves steal. It should direct attention to the thoughts of the heart, not to the dainties of the table, to the spirit within, not to the style of the jacket, to the attitude toward God, not to the bank account, to the motives, not to the investments, to the love, not to the ticket to be voted. God in Christ through the Spirit of God will, if anyone desires it, guide each individual in these and *all* other matters. The church had better win the man to the Master before attempting even to bring up temporal matters with him. Indeed, one may well believe the worldling will handle such matters better than the church will handle them for him.

The church of Rome sets the example of tampering with temporal affairs. It is its weakness. Free men resent it. That

s true of many of its own membership. "One is your Master and all ye are brethren," says the Lord. That Master is not the church; it is the Lord.

The State Church of Britain is touched with this heresy. The late Doctor Temple claimed authority for the church when he said in Albert Hall in London in 1942, "We are here to affirm the right and the duty of the church to declare its judgment upon social facts and social movements. . . . It has always been recognized that the church is called upon to lay down principles for the government of individual life." He further claims, "the right of the church also to lay down principles for the conduct of great corporations of people—trade unions, employers' federations, national states and the like."

The church that Doctor Temple speaks for has the right to lay down just two principles—Love God supremely and thy neighbor as thyself. (And only to the church can even these principles be "laid down." Those rejecting Him who gave these principles, will give no attention to any principles of the rejected one, nor to the church that speaks for Him.) But Doctor Temple was adding other principles that the church he spoke for "lays down." In that same address he names two matters that the church must deal with—namely, (1) "Economic distribution," and (2) "the profit motive." When Doctor Temple spoke at any time as the Christian gentleman that he was, he was well worth listening to. When the church, in Doctor Temple's voice, "lays down" the law in the field of economic distribution, it is being used to back up Doctor Temple's ideas on economic distribution. And his ideas can be shot full of holes. It is a serious matter, this burdening the church with one's own very limited outlook on economic distribution.

II

As to laying down the law concerning the "profit motive," one must admit the right of the church to insist on Christian motives as a must for Christian believers. The church must proclaim that love must be the controlling motivation in every act of the Christian. However, to tell the Christian businessman what profit he shall take is to lord it over him, which Jesus says is a worldly, barbarian custom. "Not so shall it be among you." The Christian man knows that the motive of his service through his business must be love. He accepts the Lord's and no other order as to how to express such motive. He knows there must be profit, and he knows how to make it. If he does not know how, he will not long be a businessman, though he may still be a Christian.

And now the American Protestant churches are to some extent edging along toward this assumption of authority in the field of economics, social set-up, politics and business. It is not the business of the church; it is the business of the individual man, Christian or infidel. It belittles the church to assume knowledge that it has not, to dictate where it has no authority, and to prophesy without being sent.

The church has a God-given service to render to mankind. It has no call to be worldly-wise. Its service is vital. It answers the cry that comes from the depths of the human heart—the cry of Pilgrim as he rushes from the City of Destruction, Life! Life! Life! It points man to the Son of God that taketh away the sin of the world. The church must clarify its conception of its mission. It must recognize the fact that the individual Christian man has his duties and responsibilities that are *his own—his and not the church's.* The Christian should recognize no authority except that of his Lord. Again and again the church has attempted to lord it over man only to find out that man resents its interference. Again and again it has had to repent of its folly because its demands have been proven by their fruits to be of man and not of God. It has gone out of its sphere. That sphere is a limited one. Certainly the Christian man has a sphere of operation, and clearly his responsibility also is limited. These

two circles are not identical. They have influence over each other. The man and the church have the mutual obligation as Paul puts it to "Owe no man [or church] anything but to love one another." Under that situation the church owes it to the world to tell the good news of the Gospel; on his part the individual, whether Christian or not, has care of his family, his business, his citizenship, his investments (if he has such), his social life, and his sports. If one may use Paul's insight, we may learn that both church and the individual person are members of the body of Christ, and neither is the Head. Neither can say to the other, "I have no need of you." Each in his own sphere may, should, must serve the common Lord. In such service of her Lord the Church finds its reason for being. That is why a church.

"Come Unto Me," Said the Master

The Rev. Samuel Lawrence Johnson
Park Manor Congregational Church, Chicago, Illinois

JESUS conceived his mission in these terms: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me: for he has anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he has sent me to proclaim release for the captives and recovery of sight for the blind, to set free the oppressed." What better statement of purpose can the modern minister proclaim?

It would seem that there has never been a time in which men did not confide in their religious leaders and from them seek assurance, forgiveness, mental and spiritual health.

When a man obtains ordination into the ministry of the church of Christ he announces to the world that he is willing to accept the challenge of Jesus to feed the hungry, welcome strangers, clothe the needy, visit the sick and imprisoned. He said: "In as much as ye have done it unto one of these my brethren, even the least, ye did it unto me."

As we study the life of Jesus we are aware that no one ever came to him with a problem which he did not face. No one was permitted to think that his difficulty was insignificant. All were treated the same by the great Physician of Souls. He saw in men things other men did not see; he recognized in man what they were unaware of in themselves and helped them become cognizant not only of their faults but of their capabilities.

Today the Protestant minister is challenged as was his Master by the mental, emotional and spiritual illnesses of the men and women of the community which he serves.

Illness of the spirit and of the emotions may often be aborted if an individual can come under the care and observation of a carefully prepared parish minister. The minister must never try to take the place of a psychiatrist—that is not his job, he has a unique field. By the relieving of spiritual and emotional tensions and the redirecting of spiritual energy he can bring about an entirely new outlook on life.

Are our Protestant ministers, however, properly and adequately trained for this particular ministry?

During the winter of 1947 the chaplain's office at Chicago's famed Wesley Memorial Hospital conducted a study which indicated that perhaps the average minister is not altogether fully competent in this field. It was learned that:

1. Many patients did not want their minister to know they were hospitalized. (A similar study in the Bethany Hospital, Chicago, showed that 35 per cent of the patients in this institution definitely did

not want their minister to call upon them.)

2. A distressing number of local ministers when informed by the Chaplain's office that a parishioner was a patient in the hospital failed to make a call.

3. Many of those ministers who made calls on parishioners in the hospital did more harm to the patient than good.

An air of mystery hangs around illness with its medical treatment and strange smells. The visitors may often be shocked or made uncomfortably curious by what they hear and see. The patient, although perhaps not understanding them, quickly detects such attitudes. Clergymen, like most laymen, are fearful in the presence of illness or when called upon to visit the sick room. Fear is contagious. If a minister is the visitor the patient may react by losing confidence in the clergyman, questioning the doctor's treatment, or just becoming more jittery generally.

I

What then is the answer to this situation? First the minister must acquire particular understandings and techniques. All too often his knowledge of illness is only general. Furthermore, he must learn to become aware of and recognize tensions and have very specific knowledge as to how to cope with them.

The best way for a minister in the United States to acquire knowledge and skills for the care of the ill is by enrolling himself for clinical training in one of the many great hospitals where he can be guided by the physicians and other ministers who have given particular attention to this specific work.

The clergyman taking clinical training is first introduced to general hospital routine. The instructor in nursing arts undertakes to familiarize him with bedside techniques. He makes beds, manipulates all of the gadgets that can be incorporated into a hospital bed and learns that a bed pan won't bite.

The minister associates with the doctors. He goes on rounds with specialists, as do the interns and residents, and learns first-hand the various types of treatment used. He comes to know the doctor on his home ground and the doctor becomes acquainted with him. The clergyman asks questions of the medical specialist and the physician of the clergyman. They come to respect each other for their individual talents and training.

The operating room with all its drama makes up a part of the everyday life of the minister's training in a hospital. He learns the language of the medical man and is not frightened by the many methods of therapy. Finally he calls on patients.

Some patients are referred to him by doctors who recognize spiritual illness and feel that their patient will recover much more quickly if his inner tensions are released by discussing intimate problems with someone whom he feels he can trust. Other patients are referred by nurses, other patients, orderlies, maids, and the social-service department—in fact anyone who has contact with the man or woman who is sick.

After his period of training the clergyman is ready to return to the parish ministry. He has become familiar with illness, is not frightened nor shocked by it. He has learned techniques and skills, which he will find ever helpful in working with his parishioners.

II

The pastor enters a counseling situation differently from any other person, psychiatrist, psychiatric social worker or other psychotherapist, for the clergyman comes to the counselee as the direct representative of God. Parishioners may at times view their ministers as errand boys and baby tenders or professional entertainers, but at one and the same time they see them as uniquely set apart. The minister must think of himself particularly as God's assistant and be aware that God may use him in an unknown way to create peace of mind. He is a particular instrument that God may use in His dealings with His children.

The psychiatrist and others who are professional counselors must wait for clients to come to them for help—the clergyman goes looking for trouble. Part of his work is to call constantly upon his parishioners with ear and mind sharply tuned for signs of distress. He often knows a good deal about the situation before he is formally asked to give help. The alert pastor will call with the attitude that each and every one of his flock has problems to solve and will assume that he might be asked to give help. He will pick up undertones and overtones in conversation and reflect them, hoping that in so doing his parishioner may become conscious of some point of tension.

The pastor must listen. Among Russell L. Dick's many contributions to pastoral work none is more significant than his constant insistence upon what he calls the "Listening Ministry." Freud's great discovery was that many mental disturbances and emotional upsets could be alleviated through an individual's verbalizing his problem. Putting into words problems and tensions in the presence of a trusted individual, who has the skill occasionally to reflect particular relevant observations may stimulate further thought, give comfort and direction.

The idea that the pastor listen does not carry with it the suggestion that he go to sleep, rather he must be actively awake to everything that is said, make very careful notes of each conference, trying as nearly as possible to record verbatim everything that is said both by the counselee and the counselor. By a careful study of these notes insight may be gained by the pastor. Medicine did not begin to progress until post-mortems became the practice. It was through carefully analyzing his mistakes that the physician learned. All too many pastors are content to shrug off their mistakes and forget about them.

Questions do not necessarily have to be omitted from the listening ministry. As the surgeon uses the scalpel so the counselor can employ the proper questions to open up vast unexplored areas. But the questions must be handled with forethought and dexterity. The physician could open a patient's abdomen with one deep cut—but he doesn't do that. Each stroke of the knife is made with considered care, each blood vessel must be ligatured or the loss of blood might easily kill the patient. The skilled counselor will move very slowly, asking questions only when the counselee is ready to answer. The art of asking questions is the chief art of pastoral relations.

III

The pastor must ever be cautious of proceeding more quickly than the parishioner is ready to go. Because of his wide contacts the minister may be able to penetrate the needs and conflicts of his counselee, but he must never betray this knowledge until the person whom he is trying to aid arrives at a point of acceptance. After the counselee has embraced a fact then the pastor can elaborate and interpret perhaps with some real advantage. A good adage to keep in mind is that "The longest way around is the shortest way home."

Interpretation is sometimes demanded —time may be short and this method resorted to in order to save others than the counselee from suffering more pain than necessary. Interpretation is an explaining of causes underlying particular behavior. This is related to the process of active listening and is used in conjunction with the listening ministry, but it can also be a very dangerous method in the counseling procedure. The danger lies in the pastor not being able to give the correct interpretation. No matter how true a thing may be in his mind, unless it is acknowledged as true by the counselee it has no validity. "A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still," has been the traditional way of stating this long-recognized fact.

When the parishioner-counselee has been given an opportunity by his minister to state his problem, tensions, and wrong

doings and the like, and the conference has come to a conclusion, a simple statement to the effect: "I am sure that God understands and will help you," or "I know that with God's help we will be able to shed light upon this situation," will give confidence and strength.

There is a considerable difference between the statement of reassurance by the Protestant minister and the statement of absolution by the priest. The statement of absolution carries a tone of finality, suggesting that that which has been done is past and over with. The Protestant reassurance is far more wholesome in that it recognizes everything one does has a continuing effect upon one's life. The effect of any experience upon an individual cannot be eradicated, but it can be minimized by proper knowledge and understanding.

Reassurance must be utilized with care by the pastor. He must not use it unless he is perfectly certain that what he says appears to him to be absolutely true. His word of reassurance will be embraced by his counselee and relied upon. Should, however, this word of reassurance be given heedlessly, conflict will in all probability result in the mind and personality of the counselee. It is beholding upon the parish minister-counselor to do no harm.

IV

The particular personal crises which come most often to the attention of the parish minister may be classified under the headings of: pain, fear, guilt feelings, and loneliness.

Pain is that emotional disturbance caused by severe distress of body or mind. It is the unpleasant sensation aroused by the excitation of nerves or nerve endings —it is the exact opposite of the sensation of pleasure. This experience may be brought on by hunger, thirst, physical injury or mental trauma.

This sensation is not without positive value. Without pain the individual would not have any warning of impending danger or harm. We should fall prey to all sorts of destructive forces and elements which, because of pain, can either be avoided, alleviated or controlled.

Pain of unknown origin makes man search for the cause—and when he cannot find the cause seek for palliatives. When the pain results from emotional or spiritual trauma the clergyman may help his parishioner recognize the cause and, having diagnosed it, assist in the building up or the rebuilding of spiritual resources. When it is the sequel of physical hurt through disease or accident, he can lead the sufferer to the living waters, to that place where he may find "the peace which passeth all understanding."

Fear is basic and primitive. This is an emotion we hold in common with all of the animal kingdom. It is the reaction of the being as a preparation for conflict. It is instinctive when we are confronted with uncertainty. It is the desire to escape from something that may possibly cause pain. It is an emotion characterized by dread or expectation of harm. It is a condition which the individual can be aware of in himself.

A second type of fear is a hidden or unrecognized emotion. In this one strives to escape from something—but does not realize it. It is apprehension which gnaws at one's poise and faith. This is the fear of failure which is without basis; the unaccountable fear of high places; close places; animals; the dark; or any number of other things. This is the fear which destroys an individual's confidence and which seeks relief in a psychosis.

Fear can be a protective emotion if rightly understood, but it can also be one of the most destructive forces known to man. The role of the minister counselor is to explore, with the counselee, fears and the reasons for his fears, and help him to adjust his thinking along healthful lines. The clergyman can be a particularly valuable aid in cases of fear of death. He has a faith in a moral God and in the fact of the immortality of the soul. By conveying his own confidence he can assist

his counselee to gain a firm grasp of truth, and truth will banish fear.

Guilt feelings, like fear, are of two distinct types. The first is recognized; it is on the conscious level. The second is the hidden or the unconscious feelings of guilt caused by those things which we have forced into forgetfulness.

Often it is guilt feelings that bring the minister face to face with the question of God's punishment for wrongdoing. It is here that the counselor will have to think through carefully the sources of suffering. He must be cognizant of the system of laws by which the world is held together; the laws which make a cosmos out of what would otherwise be a chaos. Protestants must become far more realistic concerning guilt feelings. The Roman Catholic confession is helpful in cases of conscious guilt feelings but of little value in deep-rooted hidden emotions. If the Protestant can come to feel that he, like the Roman Catholic, has someone who will listen to him when he wants to talk—his spiritual and emotional health is bound to be improved.

Loneliness is an emotion commonly met by the pastor counselor, for it underlies much of human behavior. It stimulates the love of one human being for another. It is responsible for the attachment between children and parents. It is that emotion which has caused men to gather in communities. Loneliness is almost as basic in human nature as fear.

Loneliness is a very strong factor in causing men to seek after the presence of God. It is man's feeling of aloneness which makes the presence of God such a necessary thing. It is doubtful if man would have sought God had not it been for this strong desire for the comforting feeling of a strength which he believes is in God.

A man's loneliness causes him to do one of two things or both: he becomes aggressive or deeply depressed. Like the other emotions described, loneliness can be either a blessing or a curse depending entirely upon how it is used.

V

Being a friend to a man and opening up the way to the presence of God are the two things the pastor-counselor can do to give comfort and help a person gain healthful stimulation from this universal sensation. Acute loneliness if prolonged over a protracted period of time may lead to disorientation and serious mental disturbances. It may bring about depression, intense worry, anxiety, drinking, sexual laxness and actual physical illness. Loneliness is a strange emotion. It has created some of the world's greatest sinners and some of her greatest saints. Prayer—one of the most potent therapeutic media available to the counselor—is used almost exclusively in pastoral work. Prayer makes the counselee vividly aware that he is not alone in his struggle, and if he can be taught to relax, think about God, bathe himself in the spirit, he will gain comfort and fortitude.

God does not send unhappiness and pain because he wants men to suffer. Man causes pain for himself. God is not a malicious God, rather He is a God who stands ready to help man to control and correct. When one considers the things that cause man's discomfort: self-pity, inferiority, lack of or fear for security, loss of prestige, loss of affection, old age, envy, anger, physical excesses, disease, hunger, bereavement, and a whole host of other things—one realizes only too well that these do not come from God—they are man-created. God has shown man and would show him further how to correct much of that which upsets his peace of mind. Prayer, communion with God, clarifies and removes obstacles to inner peace.

Frustration, most simply defined, is wanting something in vain. The mental pain aroused by frustration can be extremely intense. Prayer is one of the most effective instruments for relieving such pain. Through prayer the parishioner-counselee can face up to his desire-question if his wishes are valid. One of the most difficult tasks for everybody is to

learn we cannot have everything. There are many limits to desire. One can cry a lifetime for the moon but one will never get it. Time, health, strength and any number of other factors determine these limits.

Prayer-meditation in the presence of God can assist in establishing these limits in the mind, then redirect and sublimate one's spontaneous desires to chosen ends. In prayer one offers up one's desire to God, and questions, in His presence, if what one desires is worth while or if it is what one should desire. If our desires are good for us then God will help us to fulfill them—if not He can give us comfort.

Experience reveals that many frustrated, defeated, thoroughly unhappy people have found guidance through prayer. What God does in prayer is to speak to our conscious mind through our subconscious and to make clear hidden sources of strength. Paul said, "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." That is the sum and substance of the value of prayer in cases of troubled mind, for "If God be for us who can be against us?"

VI

Man can have peace of mind if he is willing to search for it. The search may sometimes be difficult. The pastor-counselor must be ready and willing to step in when the difficulties are recognized by the parishioner, to lead him to find the help of God. Jesus said: "Let not your heart be troubled: believe in God, believe also in me. . . . Peace I leave with you. . . . Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid. . . . In the world ye have tribulations: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

"JESUS, FRIEND, SO KIND AND GENTLE"

Tune: "Dismissal" William L. Viner, 1845

Jesus, Friend, so kind and gentle,
Little ones we bring to Thee;
Grant to them Thy dearest blessing,
Let Thine arms around them be;
Now enfold them in Thy goodness,
From all danger keep them free.

Thou Who didst receive the children
To Thyself so tenderly,
Give to all who teach and guide them,
Wisdom and humility;
Vision true to keep them noble,
Love to serve them faithfully.

Grant to us a deep compassion
For Thy children everywhere.
May we see our human family
Free from sorrow and despair,
And behold Thy kingdom glorious,
In our beauteous world so fair.

The Rev. Philip E. Gregory, 1948
Laguna Beach, California

The Puritan Theocracy and the Cambridge Platform

Address by Professor Roland H. Bainton
Yale University

OUR land might better be called New Canaan than New England, because our fathers braved the deep, not so much to transplant old England as to erect in this wilderness the commonwealth of the new Israel of God. The Cambridge Platform was a modest outline of their plan. It came late in the venture because at the outset they needed no blueprint; English divines of their persuasion had already delineated the essential contours. Not until the enterprise was threatened with interference from across the seas did they state the main features in order to forestall intervention. Under such circumstances they did not set forth in solemn cadences the vast design of God to be realized by His chosen people. They did not even confess their faith but were content to subscribe to the Westminster Confession. They did not disclose their dissensions lest they invite interference. Nor did they betray and probably did not perceive the imminent disintegration of their theocracy. In terse terms they outlined their structure of church and state. That and no more!

The particulars of their system will not engage the present essay. . . . I have chosen rather to deal with the problem which was central for our fathers as to whether a Christian commonwealth, with "the Lord God our Governour,"[1] is so much as possible.

That was their belief and they aspired to plant a theocracy. The very attempt, the word, in fact, is big with hope. The word means the government of God. It assumes that the Kingdom need not wait until the new Jerusalem descends from heaven, but that in this present time a new Canaan can be reared in the wilderness. . . . It is an act of faith that the Creator of the ends of the earth will not abandon His people. As He formerly manifested Himself in Christ Jesus our Lord, so now His Spirit will operate through a society chosen to execute His plan for the ages. Theocracy is therefore a creed of hope.

The mood was immensely heightened by the circumstances of the New World. Our founding fathers had sought to rear their New Canaan in old England, but finding the people there a perverse generation, rejoiced that in the New World "God hath set before us an open doore of libertie."[2] Their endeavor to take advantage of it was unique in the history of the world, and even in the history of America. They did not in a despairing mood seek to withdraw from the contamination of the world into the cloister or into a segregated community in some unnoticed spot, but under the eyes of all England set out to reap the unprecedented opportunity afforded by the discovery of a new continent. Their hope rested not on its natural resources; for they well realized that they were not going to a land flowing with milk and honey, nor one where "fountaines should streame forth Wine, or Beare" which were more to their taste. No room over there for "a dainty tooth, a beggers purse, and an idle hand"! Their concern was for "his glory

[1] [John Davenport], *A Discourse about Civil Government in the New Plantation Whose Design Is Religion* (London, 1673), p. 14. The title page attributes the tract to John Cotton.

[2] *An Answer to the Elders,* 1639 (London, 1643), p. 51.

as a principall, and all other outward good things but as accessaries."[3] The venture would not be easy, but the opportunity was unparalleled to erect on these shores a society in which God should be King among His chosen people.

I

But who were His chosen people? The answer to that question caused more difficulty than the subduing of the wilderness. All theocracies rest on the assumption that there is a chosen people but differ as to the marks. There are three types —the first is the Jewish, where the chosen people is the nation. . . . The Puritans, for all their predilection for ancient Israel, would have none of this. They were not chosen because they were Englishmen, and stoutly rejected the notion of a national church. They were not chosen because they dwelt in the Bay. There is now no land, said they, "like unto the possession which the Jews had in Canaan appropriated unto a holy people, the Seed of *Abraham:* in which they had their days prolonged. But now there is no land of that sanctimony; but now we are all strangers and sojourners. Our dwelling is but a wandering; and our abiding but as a fleeting, and our home is nowhere but in that house not made with hands, whose maker and builder is *God.*"[4]

The second great type of theocracy is the Roman Catholic, based on the sacraments as exclusive channels of grace to be administered solely by a class itself constituted through the sacrament of ordination. The priest, in consequence, assumes a unique place in society. Because the life to come far overshadows the present, and because the priest alone can insure eternal blessedness, he wields a power exceeding that of kings. . . . The clergy, then, are the chosen people, and through them God's will is realized on earth. The framers of the Cambridge Platform set themselves stoutly against such a view as an abomination of Antichrist. The minister for them enjoyed his office not by virtue of ordination but because of the call of a congregation. He was not a minister at large but only to his own congregation and only for so long as he remained in its service.

The third type of theocracy is characteristic of Protestantism and rests on inner experience. It is the most powerful but the most intangible of all, and for that reason tantalizing, tormenting and unstable. There are variations in emphasis and all had appeared prior to the erection of the Puritan commonwealth, whose uniqueness lay only in its peculiar combination of previous elements. The theocracy of inner experience was first espoused by a man whom no group is willing to acknowledge as a progenitor—that firebrand of the Peasants' War, Thomas Muentzer. He it was who declared, to the horror of Luther, that the wheat could even now be separated from the tares because the hour of the harvest had already come. The saints could be recognized and formed into a church. The test was the new birth through the incoming of the Spirit. The Bible was not necessary, though it might serve as a confirmation. The saints, once assembled into a church, should set up God's Kingdom, if need be even through the extermination of the ungodly. Here was a manifesto of theocracy and revolution.

This program in its entirety commended itself to none, but certain ingredients were appropriated by many. The Anabaptists also believed that the saints could be recognized on the basis of inner experience in the new birth. The genuineness of the experience must be evidenced by holiness of life. Aberrations should be controlled by the norm of Scripture. The saints could never hope to convert the world and should not aspire to rule the world but should withdraw, if they could, into small segregated communities, in order

[3] E. Winslow, *Good Newes from New England* (London, 1624), p. 66.

[4] R. Cushman, *The Lawfulness of Plantations,* Preamble, third page. Reprint in Edward Arber, *The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers* (London, 1897), p. 497. The passage has been condensed.

there to cultivate the way of the Lord.

The reformed churches also took over some of these ideas. Zwingli believed that the predestined could be approximately identified, and the test was faith in God and in the written word of Scripture. Since such faith was pre-eminently manifest in Zürich, he tended to identify the chosen people with the inhabitants of the Swiss city. . . . The danger was imminent that the theocracy of Zürich would degenerate into the Jewish type, but from this it was saved by the introduction of a selective principle. Catholics were excluded from office and a nucleus of the saints controlled alike church and state.

Calvin made the tests more comprehensive and less interior. For him there were three: faith, holiness and participation in the sacraments. He did not pretend that the tares could ever be completely excluded but held nevertheless that his three tests would reveal those who were presumably the chosen. Like Zwingli, he associated the elect with a particular community but on a much more selective basis. . . . The saints alone administered church and state, but the spheres were nevertheless precisely demarked. The most distinctive characteristic of Calvinism emerged only outside of Geneva where it was not in power but constituted a militant minority seeking to impose its way by the driving power of intense conviction. The optimism of the Calvinistic theocracy was akin to that of the Catholic, because it aspired to realize the divine plan not in the restricted area of Canaan, Zürich, or Geneva, but for the continent of Europe, the New World, and, in fact, the whole earth.

II

The basic pattern of the New England theocracy was Calvinism. These Puritans did not agree with Muentzer in his contempt for the Bible and in his espousal of violence. They did not agree with the Anabaptists that the ideal could be realized only on segregated groups. They did not, like Zwingli, identify the theocracy with a particular community, but rather, like Calvin, took the world as their sphere. They were agreed with him, likewise, on the relations of church and state, but there was one respect in which they diverged from the Calvinist pattern and took their stand with the Anabaptists, namely, in that they discovered the final mark of the saint in an inner experience. . . . Candidates for church membership must give evidence that "they have been wounded in their hearts for their originall sinne, and actuall transgressions, and can pitch upon some promise of free grace in the Scripture, for the ground of their faith, and that they finde their hearts drawne to beleeve in Christ Jesus, for their justification and salvation."[5] What a ring of personal experience there is in the "solemne and publick promise before the Lord, whereby a company of Christians, called by the power and mercy of God and fellowship with Christ, and by his providence to live together, and by his grace to cleave together in the unitie of faith, and brotherly love, and desirous to partake together in all the holy Ordinances of God, doe in confidence of his gracious acceptance in Christ, binde themselves to the Lord, and to one another, to walke together by the assistance of his Spirit, in all such wayes of holy worship in him and of edification one towards another, as the Gospel of Christ requireth of every Christian Church and the members thereof."[6]

How could a society founded on such requirements hope to endure? Bear in mind that the above declaration was really more than a church covenant. It was essentially a compact alike of church and civil state because the franchise was extended only to church members in the Bay and at New Haven and, if Hartford was more liberal, it mattered little because the community had few if any who were strangers to the covenant. The question

[5]Thomas Lechford, *Plain Dealing* (London, 1642); reprint Boston, 1867, ed. J. H. Trumbull, p. 19.

[6]*An Apology of the Churches in New England,* 1639 (London, 1643), p. 3.

then was not simply how could a church endure on such a basis but how could a community so grounded preserve its integrity and continuity.

There are two ways in which systems of this sort have endured. One is through converts only. . . . A religious body *can* survive on the basis of converts only. But the Puritans emphatically did not take this way. They were fruitful and multiplied and replenished the earth.

The second way in which a religious community has succeeded in perpetuating itself is by segregation. The descendants of the Anabaptists, the Hutterian Brethren and the conservative Mennonites have maintained their pattern by protecting their children from automobiles, telephones, movies and funny-papers, and they have succeeded in preserving their way of life throughout four centuries.

The Puritans were not willing to go this way. The reason was partly one of circumstance; for the Anabaptists had originated under the death penalty when fraternization with the world was impossible; whereas the Puritans arose in the midst of the democratic ferment which gave them an opportunity to survive without withdrawal and even to make an imprint upon public life. The migration to New England was of course in a way a withdrawal from old England, but in no sense intended as an abandonment of "deare *England,* left indeed by us in our persons, but never yet forsaken in our affections."[7] Neither did the colonists desire to separate from the Church of England. The preface to the Cambridge Platform declared that "wee, who are by nature Englishmen, doe desire to hold forth the same doctrine of religion (especially in fundamentals) which wee see and know to be held by the Church of England according to the truth of the Gospel."[8] Their hope was to stir up old England by their "hazardous and voluntary banishment into this remote wilderness."[9] The emigrants sought not even to segregate themselves from the Indians; for the purpose in coming had been "chiefly to display the efficacy and power of the Gospel, both in zealous preaching, Professing and wise walking under it before the faces of these poor blind infidels."[10] Neither did they separate themselves from the "unregenerated, that are Aliens to the Common-wealth of Israel, strangers to the Covenant of promise."[11]

[7]William Hooke, *New England Teares for Old Englands Feares,* 1640 (London, 1641), p. 23.

[8]The Preface, reprinted in Williston Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism* (New York, 1893), p. 194.

III

Here was the initial weakness of the entire venture, for the communities had never been properly homogeneous and contained at the outset saints and strangers, "profane men, who being but seeming Christians, have made Christ and Christianity stinks in the nostrils of the poore Infidels."[12] Ought not such to have been cast out of Israel? Not so, was the answer. . . .

The new Canaan then was resolved to maintain itself without celibacy and without segregation by making converts from without and by holding its own children from within. To do the latter proved particularly difficult. It is not easy to make Isaacs out of Abrahams, particularly if the Isaacs have been sacrificed on the altar of their fathers' idealism. And it is not easy for one generation to convey its convictions to the next if the children are thrown much with strangers to the covenant. But extremely difficult is it to transmit from parent to child an inner experience which in the nature of the case must be personal and individual. The Puritans made their problem the more difficult by passing on to their offspring a rugged honesty which made no pretense to an experience which had not been experi-

[9]John Cotton, *The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared* (London, 1648), p. 102.

[10]R. Cushman, *The Lawfulness of Plantations,* reprint Arber, p. 502.

[11]Thomas Hooker, *The Saints Dignitie and Dutie* (London, 1651), p. 98.

[12]E. Winslow, *Good Newes from New England* (London, 1624), end of the dedication.

enced, even though the lack of it meant exclusion from the church, and from the government, and from eternal life. And those Puritan parents, however much they yearned to have their children beside them at the table of the Lord, continued to be exacting and did not receive any on the basis of blood without the proof of inward regeneration. Even a good life did not suffice, for that might be pure hypocrisy. "There must be an expression of inward goodnesse of the heart, . . . a good sap in the botome"[13] of the tree.

But might not this be demanding a little too much? Anne Hutchinson thought not. She brought forth the distinction between the covenant of grace and the covenant of works and would base the church solely on the former. John Cotton wavered, but he came to see that the distinction is exceedingly difficult to discern. "A poore Christian will be put to much exercise to find a difference between himself" and a hypocrite.[14] The practical conclusion was that if so high a degree of inwardness were demanded the church would dwindle from a holy commonwealth into a holy conventicle. The Cambridge Platform recommended therefore that "severity of examination is to be avoyded . . . and such charity and tenderness is to be used as the weakest Christian if sincere may not be excluded." The tests should be only vigorous enough to satisfy "a rational charity."[15]

IV

In this spirit the saints were defined as first: "Such as have not only attained the knowledge of the principles of Religion, and are free from gross and open scandals, but also do together with the profession of their faith and Repentance, walk in blameless obedience to the word, so as that in charitable discretion they may be accounted Saints by calling, (though perhaps some or more of them be unsound, and hypocrites inwardly:)"; and, second, "The children of such, who are also holy."[16]

Yet how could infants meet the tests of even the most "charitable discretion," and should they then in no sense be regarded as members of the church? The Anabaptists said that they should not, and one would have expected the Congregationalists, with their theory of the gathered church, to take the same position. But they argued that children are "under the wing of the covenant."[17] Such children must, on attaining years of discretion, make their own profession before admission to communion, but from infancy they are under "church watch" and "if not regenerated, yet are in a more hopefull way of attayning regenerating grace."[18] So far so good for the second generation, but how about the third? Suppose the child of a saint were unable to make the profession? Should his child in that case be pushed out from under the wing of the covenant or received on the basis, not of his parents' but of his grandparents' faith? The more lenient answer was of course that of the Half-Way Covenant. So far the Cambridge Platform was not prepared to go. Only the first generation of the offspring of the saints might be included,[19] and yet the Platform suggests a movement in the direction of the hereditary principle when it compares baptism to circumcision,[20] the rite of initation into a national community. The framers were starting down the road which was to convert the elect of New Canaan into the elite of New England, but they did not

[13]Thomas Hooker, *The Faithful Covenanter* (London, 1644), p. 16.

[14]John Cotton, *A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace* (London, 1671), p. 47.

[15]Cambridge Platform XII, 2 and 3, Walker, p. 222.

[16]*Ibid.*, III, 1 and 2, Walker, pp. 205–206.

[17]John Cotton, *A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace* (London, 1671), p. 205.

[18]Cambridge Platform XII, 7, Walker, p. 224.

[19]*Ibid.*, III, 2, Walker, p. 206. *Cf. Church-Government and Church-Covenant* (London, 1643), p. 22, Scripture "seemes to limit this faederall sanctity or holynesse to the Children whose next Parents one or both were Believers. . . . And if we should goe one degree beyond the next Parents, we see not but we may goe two and if two, why not 3.4.20.100, or 1000? For where will you stop?"

[20]Cambridge Platform IV, 5, Walker, p. 200.

intend or foresee the outcome. They entrenched themselves on the middle lane between the Covenant of Grace and the Half-Way Covenant, and that lane after two decades faded out.

Was it because they refused to simplify their program and adopt either celibacy or segregation? Was it simply that increasingly the strangers invaded the land and came to outnumber the saints? But have we any right to ask such questions which betray too great concern for numbers and the survival of outward communities? We do better to discern that what was envisaged for New England has in many respects become a pattern for the United States. Essentially that Puritan theocracy was the attempt of a determined minority to set the tone for a community by the use of a maximum of persuasion and a minimum of constraint. The Mayflower Compact is itself very instructive at this point. Even on that first voyage the strangers began to murmur against the saints. And the saints did not throw them overboard but assembled the entire company, drafted a constitution and insured consent by the sheer force of moral conviction. So it was very largely in that New Canaan. The intolerance has been grossly exaggerated, for in the century and a half of colonial history the exercise of severe measures was rare and banishment was a more lenient penalty then than ever before or since, because in virgin territory there was somewhere else to go.

That Puritan venture, rooted and grounded in faith, has left a residue of faith which survives as "reverent unbelief" even at Harvard. The reverence is not for unbelief but for faith. In this land of ours those who cannot believe are ready to yield direction in some measure to those who can, and that is why convinced minorities are able to exert an influence out of all proportion to their numbers. By reason of such nuclei the whole of the United States has come to think of itself as in some sense a chosen people with a mission and a responsibility to the world.[21] The danger of hypocrisy is patent. The need for sincerity is urgent. All of the world looks to us as a land now actually flowing with milk and honey that we may not only feed the hungry but restore faith to the desolate.

The resolve of John Cotton was not vain when he said: "And therefore it is for us to doe all the good we can, and to leave nothing to those that shall come after us, but to walk in the righteous steps of their fore-Fathers. And therefore let us not leave, nor give rest to our eyes, until in Family, Church and Commonwealth we have set a patterne of holinesse to those that shall succeed us."[22]

Such was the woof of the framers of the Cambridge Platform. The external lineaments of their holy commonwealth have perished, yet a spiritual heritage survives, and if over the outward structure we must write the word "failure," then one should add that the failures of history in the eyes of God are often more significant than the successes.

[21]The claim to constitute a middle way is very common in the history of the Church. Cotton made it for Congregationalism as lying between Brownism and Presbyterianism, *Keys of the Kingdom* (London, 1644).

[22]John Cotton, *An Exposition upon the Thirteenth Chapter of the Revelation* (London, 1655), p. 77.

Behind the Mirror

The Editor

THERE was a Cheshire Cat in *Alice in Wonderland* with a sense of humor and a friendly disposition; at least it grinned, though there is no intimation why. Then, as may easily happen in Wonderland, the cat faded out of the tree-top and only the grin was left. The clever thing in the best illustrated edition of what happened to Alice when she went through the mirror is that one really sees the cat, which is not there at all, behind the grin. Well, we live, so they tell us, in a wonderland which makes what happened to Alice inconsequential, and we are especially ingenious in getting the grin without the cat.

One has only to turn a button and his room is full of voices, only voices and nothing more. Even "Lewis Carroll" never thought of that. The voices are by no means impersonal, one comes to recognize them in time. They are artful voices, artful in timing, intonation, intimation and overtone. They secure, as far as wavelengths can, the effect of a living presence—without the presence. A listening preacher may well wonder what would happen to his preaching if he ceased to be seen as a physical and probably gesticulating presence and became for his congregation only a voice.

There are advantages. When commentators are only voices, they get invested with mystery and more or less spurious authority and become even awesome, as though they were understudies for omniscience, and no one dares to say to them, as Alice said to the Red Queen, "You are only a pack of cards." Voices do gain by detachment and so become impersonal. The Editor saw one of the most famous commentators in television lately. He was just an elderly man in a rather querulous temper. If he sat in one's room and one could say to him, if he were impolite enough, "What do you really know that the rest of us do not know?" he might be hard put to it to answer, but make him just a voice, the grin without the cat, and he moulds public opinion, maybe.

No authoritative study of the effect of radio preaching upon church attendance and religious interest seems to have been made in America. In England, according to an article in *Advance,* "It has been established that, on an average, more than a third of the adult population of Great Britain listen to at least one religious broadcast." The Federal Council, through some proper agency, might profitably make a similar study. Beyond debate, radio preaching advertises the church which has the microphone and the minister behind it. What it (radio preaching) does to other churches and ministers and the old, old habit of going to church is another question.

Phillips Brooks' classic definition of preaching as the mediation of truth through personality, becomes unexpectedly apposite. How far can voice and presence be separated in preaching, for preaching has been a voice and a presence since preaching began. Preaching has always been a voice *plus,* or else its historic function seems mortally impaired. Very often the "plus" has been the real power of the voice. Now television promises to add some show of a presence to the voice. It is as yet a quite tenuous and flickering presence, subject to various hazards, but most things begin or began that way. What will happen when television gets into pulpits? It will be slower than the radio in climbing pulpit stairs, but eventually it will. Will it, then, be one more contribution to the dissolution of inherited orders and ways, while the devout

urn on channel X and worship in easy hairs?

* * *

Emerson found the Second Church in Boston too strait a station for the

"—— owner of the sphere,
Of the seven stars and the solar year,
Of Cæsar's hand and Plato's brain,
Of Lord Christ's heart and Shakespeare's strain,"

nd yet he held, "Two inestimable advanages Christianity has given us: first, the Sabbath, the jubilee of the whole world everywhere, suggesting, even to the vile, he dignity of spiritual being, and, secondly, the institution of preaching, the speech of man to man, essentially the most flexible of organs."

It is not easy to see how the simulacra of men speaking to men can ever be a satisfactory substitute for the real presence which more than anything else makes preaching a sacrament. It all seems to tie up in one bundle: the day which suggests to the world everywhere "the dignity of spiritual being," the "speech of man to man," and the fellowship of participation in which both are realized and without which neither can be rightly realized.

Smaller churches, and there are so many of them, unable to find adequate leadership, might put a radio in the pulpit and so secure at best a comradeship of worship with a sermon from some outstanding preacher possessing the rare gift of speaking with power to people he does not know or see. If the preacher is at the same time preaching to his own congregation with a sure sense of widely shared need, it might do. Whether such services would gain or lose by television is as you please. It would, at present, be subject to disconcerting fadings out which would leave the screen a blur. It would, at present, have the appeal of novelty, but that would, in time, level out. Television is already bound to bring changes in many fields of far-reaching consequence. Churches will probably take account of it in ways still mostly below the horizon.

But all this leaves out the living tissue of personal relationship which has hitherto been an indispensable factor in preaching, and in long-established pastorates takes precedence of almost everything else. These living tissues are so woven of sharings and understandings, and all such things which are not things at all, but the heartbeats of experience the years bring or carry away, that a minister's just being in the pulpit becomes more significant than anything he says. (He would better not, however, presume too much upon that.) It is difficult to see how any complex of gadgets can ever become the living tissues of life.

Neither television nor radio will ever become a substitute for a doctor in his office or the sickroom, nor for the pastoral relationships which are the grass-roots of preaching.

* * *

When the present seems almost hopeless and confused, one can at least try to find out how the present got the way it is, how the past dealt with its own entanglements and confusion, and how attitudes and approaches repeat themselves; which is one of the significances of history. The parallels between any past and any present are so arresting as to lead one to agree with Ecclesiastes that there is nothing new under the sun. For illustration: George Macaulay Trevelyan's *British History in the Nineteenth Century*. Trevelyan is a name to conjure by in English historical and biographical writing, and this history maintains the tradition. There are illuminating chapters on the Industrial Revolution, the economical and social changes thus engendered, and the slow and always embattled process of economic, social and political reform.

Trevelyan notes at length what most contemporary American historians ignore in our own history: the services and disservices of church leaders and church life.

The dissenters make a far better showing, according to Trevelyan, who is probably an Anglican, than the "Establishment," which on the contrary made a very bad showing. The forgotten, the submerged, found escape, compensation and comfort in their churches to which the Established Church then denied and still denies the name church. But there was a force in their "tin chapels" not found in Canterbury or the Abbey. There the socially dispossessed had something of their own. There censorship and prohibitions could not quite reach them.

Amongst these "sects," against whom the voting booth, any kind of office and university doors were barred, who were forbidden the right to bury their dead after their own simple rites, the four freedoms found a tenacious and prophetic shelter.

There, says Trevelyan, man first learned to speak, to organize, to persuade and trust their fellows. There talents were developed and instincts gratified, elsewhere denied expression. The imagination was kindled, the powers of expression educated by the study of the Bible and their spirits were tempered by what they had to bear. There were the nurseries of trade unions and cooperative activities. There forces of incalculable power shaped themselves. There British labor unions took form under the leadership of lay-preachers and were thus given a quality they have never had in America. In an intolerable world, Trevelyan continues, "here was a refuge when men and things were taken up aloft and judged by spiritual and moral standards that forbade either revenge or despair."

* * *

For this wandering editorial the point is: that the intimacies and fellowship of a church have a quality for which there is no substitute. In countrysides and the loneliness of great industrial cities, something precious, beyond the power of words easily to say, is thus nourished and sheltered. In the Detroit the Editor knew there was across the years a confused and confusing response of Detroit churches and church life to that city's spectacular growth. Many of the older churches followed migratory parishioners to the mansions of the prosperous (on the earth) and there built for themselves sanctuaries of spacious and pictured window beauty. More of the smaller neighborhood churches losing membership and support, lived on precariously, united with another church, or had their day and ceased to be. The Roman Catholic Church bought such of these church properties as suited their purposes; others were sold for the value of their real estate and some were taken over by marginal religious groups, curiously named, which during the years under review began to appear in increasing numbers on drab and smoke-darkened streets. Why? Partly because they believed themselves witnesses to some neglected truth, or took Biblical commands in embarrassing literalness, or because they were born separatists. But more than anything else probably because they were lonely and socially unimportant, and so sought fellowship in about the oldest fellowship-sustaining force in human history, group religion. Also, wanting something particularly their own, they got themselves a church. When the churches become the Church, rigid, totalitarian, needs and habits old as human nature reassert themselves in separatist movements whose positive power it is not well to overlook. The pioneers of new Ecumenical orders would be wise to take all this into account.

* * *

Lent has become a habit even for nonliturgical churches and has now, in the observance of it, lost the appeal of novelty. It has always asked and offered inner reconciliations and sought to deepen the devotional life. There are timeless values in self-examination, self-denials, repentances and rededication to Christian goodness, love and duty. It is a good time to cultivate acquaintances with those who

have practiced the Presence of God, or excelled in some quality of their souls or at great cost overcome the world. These have a power to correct excessive concern for possession and the dominance of things over the spirit.

It is a good time to live with poets who have made a music of courage and furnished faith with wings and have not been afraid of dreams. "For he whom a dream has possessed knoweth no more of doubting." A not-too-long book by Douglas Speere, *Doors into Life* (Harper and Brothers), is a good guide for Lenten reading. Not only because it considers devotional classics, but because Speere writes so simply and wisely of what devotion really is; the yielding of the core of being to the right loyalties. Perhaps the tragedy of our time and of so many other times is the misdirection of loyalties. There has never been amongst us ever any lack of loyalty to some cause or other, to some leader or other, or any dearth of devotion to some end or other. Battlefields have been dyed red with loyalties and devotions ever since battlefields began.

Inner devotions, solitary wealth of spirit, have a value not to be underestimated, but unless devotion be evoked for and channeled toward Christian ends and orders, it becomes solitary and too often sterile. To deepen devotion toward the Master and his causes, to instruct it and very greatly to direct it toward social and ethical ends might be a reasonable office of Lenten preaching.

* * *

Years ago the Editor found such great pleasure in Augustine Birrell's *Collected Essays and Addresses* that they have escaped the successive liquidations of his library. Birrell himself has protested the right of anyone who has less than 10,000 volumes to speak of his "library." "Until you have 10,000 volumes, the less you say about your library the better, *then* you may begin to speak." John Morley said much the same thing. The charm and variety of Birrell's writing reads for itself, and the volumes bear rereading astonishingly.

For they make one want to read the books about which he writes, which is always the signal service of good literary criticism. If a cupful is good, why not go to the spring? There is, Birrell says, a slow testing by time of all creative work. Out of this long process something in literature survives and is not thereafter lost. More than once the qualities which win for an author his laurel crown of fellowship with the elect, escaped the prevision of the critics and still defy analysis, though some essays of Matthew Arnold and Sainte-Beuve come as near discovering the secrets of distinction and perpetuity in the great classics, as anything else written. Jeffrey said, and quite wrongly, of Wordsworth (or was it Keats?)—"This will not do." Time says of a book or a song, "This will do," and thereafter it is secure. Those of whom Birrell writes are so well worth reading, because they themselves knew how to write. They wrote with a noble elevation and a high concern for their art. Good writing needs spacious regions, high seriousness, as Matthew Arnold said, and some tincture of imagination which may lead Keats from the song of a nightingale to "Ruth in Tears Amid the Alien Corn."

Preaching has the right of eminent domain in the provinces of literature. Sermons themselves have more often been literature than critics concede, and in one great period definitely influenced English literature itself. Theologians and philosophers have not commonly been good writers. Their subject matter cabins and confines them. The preacher needs to turn to other sources. The contribution of letters to preaching is not so much in the show of erudition or apt quotation, but in something still more deeply interfused; in an at-homeness in the best the masters have thought and said; in overtones of style, harmonic ways with words and above all in freshness of approach to the meanings and mysteries of life. So much a minister is urged to read may inform

his mind, but, if he does not take great care, it will dry out his style and pain his soul. At any rate, if any reader of this QUARTERLY can find Birrell's three volumes, and for a little live with them, he will find therein a reader's land of pure delight. There are exceptions, of course —he is not at his best in dealing with ecclesiastical controversy. Such controversies have not commonly created a literature which bears the test of time. But he does assemble for his readers a very noble company and thereto bids them welcome. The company itself is generous and welcomes upon no conditions at all, save the condition of becoming their friends, anyone who cares to foregather with the immortals.

Freedom and Responsibility

The Rev. Richard W. Ingle, B.D.
Union Congregational Church, Calipatria, California

IF each one of us were asked to make out a list of those blessings in life which were essential for happiness, certainly on every one of our lists would appear the word, "Freedom." How tremendously important has become the meaning of this concept in our lives, especially after living through the past decade. In spite of the abstract "hair-splitting" of theologians and philosophers over the question whether man possesses free-will with all of its implications of freedom and responsibility of choice, or whether man is predestined and determined by a superior power or circumstances beyond his control, all of us have most certainly come to the practical conclusion that not only is human freedom a reality in life, but one of the indispensable realities of life.

World War II cast in sharp relief the issue of human freedom—whether men and nations should live in freedom or in slavery. All of us too well realize that this issue still hangs in the balance. The last decade has driven home in our minds the great truth that freedom is one of the realities in life most highly prized by human beings, that it is "the pearl of great price" which man will sacrifice, bleed and die for, that man will stop short of no lengths in achieving it. These are our convictions concerning freedom, whether it be political, social, or religious. We know that the human spirit cannot grow and thrive in a medium of oppression and blind compulsion. Without freedom the human spirit starves, as does the body without proper nourishment. One has only to mention the word, "freedom," and it meets with our approval—it is good.

Yes, freedom has become the watchword of our day. We, who live in this modern era, have placed our faith in freedom much like we have placed our destinies in the hands of scientific progress. We have, in a sense, placed a "child-like" trust in freedom's ability to redeem us, as if to be free is to be saved. We have to a great extent identified freedom wholeheartedly with happiness, as if to be free is to be happy. Have we in doing these things to a certain degree ill-used the meaning of freedom? Has our idea of freedom not only covered the thoughts of freedom of press, speech, assembly, freedom from oppression, fear, drudgery and superstition, but freedom from responsibility as well? Has our wholehearted faith in freedom carried us from *freedom of religion* to *freedom from religion?* Has our age become so intoxicated with a "gospel" of being free that we are no longer dependent upon God? Perhaps this is freedom, perhaps this is

the interpretation which our modern age has given to freedom, but it is questionable whether it has brought us either happiness or abundant living. Today many are the persons who have become disillusioned with such a licentious understanding and use of freedom.

I

Let us examine the meaning of the word, "freedom." Freedom denotes the capacity of man to make a choice or selection in the way in which he will act and react in the countless situations of life. It denotes the ability of man to choose the way-of-life, the values in life and the companions in life with whom he desires to associate. Freedom also means the ability of man to carry out the choices which he wills, free from the resistance and oppression of others—the ability to put into action and follow through that which he wills or desires. Our thoughts concerning freedom in the past few years have overwhelmingly centered on this latter meaning—the opportunity to live as we desire, free from external oppression and tyranny. This is to be expected when we consider the phenomenon of the modern totalitarian state and the human slavery it involves. Yet we must never lose sight of the idea of freedom as the ability of man to make choices—and it is this very idea which our age has obscured. Without this freedom to choose, which resides within the being of each one of us, freedom from oppression is meaningless, for life then becomes a puppet stage upon which man dances wholly at the mercy of the strings of an inevitable fate.

Let us ask ourselves these questions: Have we become so obsessed with the idea of freedom as meaning emancipation from outside restraint that our freedom has become enslaved to freedom? Does not a boundless freedom which echoes the cry, "Every man for himself, devil take the hindmost," and sets its own scale of values regardless of God, morality and order, degenerate into a moral and spiritual anarchy which is the worst kind of slavery? Does not such a boundless freedom which sloughs off all semblance of responsibility not only to man, but God as well, shackle the human spirit instead of freeing it, in the very fact that it destroys the capacity for choice? For if man becomes a little god unto himself, above right and wrong, above all thought of responsibility, what can he possibly choose? *Freedom to him has lost its meaning.* Instead of achieving the coveted laurel of freedom from restraint, he becomes enslaved unto himself, enchained to his slightest moods, fears, and desires. He becomes a pathetic creature of appetites, devoid of rhyme or reason, driven hither-and-yon by drives which he cannot understand.

Such a misunderstanding and abuse of freedom resounds throughout life. How many broken homes are the bitter fruits of such a desire for unbounded freedom, because one or both of the marriage partners have "freed" themselves from the "old-fashioned" responsibilities of Christian marriage. How much of our crime results from the "greater" freedom when men place themselves above the responsibility of right and wrong to their neighbors. How much international strife is the result of a "freedom" which sloughs off all responsibility of justice of nation toward nation. Yes, our age has dedicated itself to unbounded freedom from restraint; but it has in return reaped the bitter harvest of slavery to fear, remorse, doubts, hatred, and meaninglessness. Is it any wonder that our age has become disillusioned and wanting in happiness and inner peace?

II

True moral freedom, which is so essential to life, is, paradoxically enough, interdependent with responsibility. When we throw to the winds our responsibilities and duties of life we destroy our freedom —for they are dependent upon each other. It is easy to see that we are morally re-

sponsible for something only if we possess freedom of choice in dealing with that particular something. This is widely illustrated in the processes of law which permeate the varied facets of human society. However, it is more difficult to understand that we can only be morally free if we are subject to responsibility. The interdependence of freedom and responsibility creates a paradoxical relationship because responsibility posits a moral determination which is antithetical to freedom as it is usually defined.

Responsibility presupposes a value-judgment of life which transcends nature and its natural determinations. Responsibility is a human objective recognition that there are values and ideals above natural impulse which not only partake of truth and reality, but are essential to the fulfillment of man's highest nature. This responsibility is substantiated in the general sense of justice and in the particular senses of honor, duty and obligation, the cohesive forces of human society. It is not until man *feels* responsibility that he becomes a moral creature, for it is only *then* that the moral potentiality of his value-judgments are actualized—theory is translated into practice—the abstract becomes the concrete—the universal finds relevancy in the particular. It is not until man actualizes his moral potential in responsibility that he becomes free, for then life is charged with allegiance and obligation to value-judgments above and beyond the determinations of natural impulse. These value-judgments, which create the sense of responsibility, transcend nature, for they assume centers of intrinsic worth *outside of self*—whereas natural impulse posits intrinsic worth as basically self-centered.

It is in the meaning derived from value-judgments that the material for choice, the indispensable basis of freedom, is created; for choice presupposes vestiges of discrimination, inference, understanding and value which are the varied facets of meaning. If those value-judgments are self-centered, as in natural impulse, there can be little moral freedom, for any choice that might be made is directed toward the self and is determined by natural appetites and passions. Right and wrong, good and evil, are purely relative and are oriented toward self—the puppets of a natural determinism. Value, goodness and truth have no objective existence outside of self except as a *means to a self-centered end.* When man, destitute of responsibility, plunges into the abyss of natural self-centeredness, the world of social relationships becomes meaningless, for the dignity and worth of human personality, in itself, are obliterated. Justice, the substantiated form of responsibility, is destroyed with the accompanying annihilation of the intrinsic value of personality. Man's fellowmen lose their independently valued existence, with all of its dignity and rights, in the eyes of the self-centered ego. Man, immersed in the anarchy of self-centeredness, looks out upon a world which is desolate in its meaninglessness. He is freed from all loyalties and duties of responsibility, because responsibility ceases to exist when value outside of self loses its intrinsic worth. In his state of freedom from responsibility he becomes enmeshed in the determinations of natural impulse and willfulness—*freedom degenerates into slavery.*

On the other hand, man experiences true freedom in responsibility, for in the latter he feels an obligation to value-judgments which transcend the self-centeredness of natural impulse. Responsibility posits the intrinsic worth of others and holds in the highest esteem those values which contribute to and sustain human dignity—it implies social cohesiveness as opposed to a "rugged individualism." Right and wrong, good and evil, become *ends in themselves* instead of means to self-centered ends and thus take on "value-in-themselves." When man heeds responsibility he submits himself to the intrinsic worth of right and wrong, good and evil. Choice ascends above the level of animal impulse and its natural determinations, and becomes subjected to

ne lofty moral determinations of right nd wrong, good and evil.

Freedom can never be completely di-orced from determinations of one kind r another—without the presence of the tter the former is utter nonsense. It is out of the soil of moral determination of responsibility that the flower of moral freedom grows. If its roots are deep in this soil it will wax strong. If those roots are torn loose from this soil of responsibility, the flower of moral freedom will die.

Prayers

The Rev. Joseph Lyle McCorison, S.T.D.
First Congregational Church, Westfield, N. J.

MERCIFUL over all Thy works art Thou, O gracious Father. With good Thou art still over-oming evil, and by small means dost Thou ccomplish great things. Thou dost sub-ert the worldly strong by things deemed veak, and by weak simplicity confound he worldly wise. Help us henceforth to earn that to obey Thee, and to love with ear the only true God, is best; to walk s in Thy presence daily; ever to observe Thy providence and on Thee solely to depend.

PRAYER OF INSTALLATION

Our gracious God and eternal heavenly Father, who has called this Thy servant nto the glorious fellowship of the min-istry of Christ and hast numbered him among the company of the prophets and apostles, the evangelists and helpers of Thy Kingdom, consecrate him with Thy blessing in these labors committed to his keeping. Pour out upon him Thy spirit and power that he may ever walk humbly before Thee, exalting this ministry with diligent faithfulness, and serving Thy people as one seeing the Invisible. As Thou dost now set him among this people as pastor and teacher, to be their priest and prophet, may he ever be mindful of that Good Shepherd of the sheep who came to minister and to give His life for many. In self-giving devotion, make him bold in declaring Thy truth, valiant against error and injustice, compassionate with the sorrowing and the suffering, patient and forgiving with the erring, meek in victory, ever seeking the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

Consecrate his mind to the earnest study of Thy word, and his will to the duty and obedience of Thy holy purpose. Make him quick to the needs of all people, taking upon himself their hunger and want, the injustice they suffer, their burdens and their lack, that in this fellowship the hungry may be truly fed, the bound made free and the weak made strong with Thy great salvation.

Bless his words, we do earnestly beseech thee, that he may speak the truth in love and thus heal hurt and discord among the flock of Christ. Bless the labor of his hands that he may be a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. And bless his witness that many be turned to Thee and shine in the firmament of Thy glory as stars forever and ever. Sustain him in wisdom and strength. Deliver him in temptation, and save him from selfish concerns and small hopes. Make him rich in friendship, understanding of the ways of little children and eager youth, gracious and considerate towards the aged, and among all people a teachable and affectionate comrade. Guide him all the day long in Thy sure path. Save him from

rashness, and at last give him the comfort and joy of a work well done to the glory of Thy holy name.

Let the spirit of peace and quiet possess his home and his heart. Unite him and his people in a common purpose to advance Thy kingdom. Grant unto him a blessed welcome into every home and make pleasant and fruitful his ways through this community. Thus may Thy will be done, Thy kingdom come, and at last the whole earth be filled with Thy glory. Amen.

DELIVERED AT A BACCALAUREATE SERVICE

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, in Whom there is no darkness at all, neither shadow of turning, Who hast given unto us the light of Thy truth so that the night shineth as the day; we praise Thee for Thy mighty salvation and for the freedom we have in Jesus Christ our Lord. Great and glorious art Thou, O Lord of Hosts, and greatly to be praised.

We come before Thee with joy and thanksgiving upon our lips for work brought to happy fruition and the thrill of a new beginning; for lessons diligently learned and skills competently acquired; for far horizons and stirring aspirations; for the fulfillment of yesterday and the promise of tomorrow.

We thank Thee for teachers eager and patient in their teaching, who by a godly example lead even reluctant scholars into the way of understanding, the appreciation of beauty, the valor of service and the nobility of the truly dedicated life. Give, O Lord, Thy gracious commendation unto them who have wrought so well with books and learning that a lamp now burns where there was darkness before. Increase among us the love of learning from which all just works proceed, and with the unfettered spirit preserve our heritage of freedom. Teach us all humility and gratitude for those who, lifting the veil of mystery, revealed to our eyes the wonders of Thy glorious universe.

Bless, we beseech Thee, these thy people —these young men and young women, who have finished the race set before them and now with ardor step forth to meet life, unafraid and confident. Sustain them, O God, with unfailing faith and fine enthusiasm, that the vision of this day may never grow dim, nor the glorious purpose now so near and shining, fade away. In the day when fretting cares multiply and hope grows feeble, revive them with a remembrance of this happy hour, that once again the light shining in the darkness about them may illumine their way and guide their feet in paths of peace and pleasantness. Give them courage for the unknown way, strength for every labor, calmness for every difficulty, and resolution for every temptation.

We pray Thee, O Lord, to bless the homes from which these Thy people have come, wherein these youths have learned to reverence Thee in holiness and glad obedience, and to love truth, mercy and cleanliness of life. Grant unto their parents the assurance that they have neither failed Thee nor their children. May they rejoice in Thy good providence and exalt Thee for Thy faithfulness which never faileth.

Finally, O Lord, we pray for the peace of our world. Silence the angry tongues clamoring for War; temper with patience those, seeking justice, who suffer tribulation and persecution; and grant us all so to follow our blessed Lord in brotherly affection and earnest endeavor for righteousness that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

The Rehabilitation of "Everyman"

The Rev. William R. Steininger
U. A. Center, State College, Raleigh, N. C.

[The writer served as a Chaplain with the Sixth Infantry Division in the Southwest Pacific and because of disability temporarily found it necessary to withdraw from the preaching pastorate. He turned to the program of the Veterans Administration and qualified as a Psychologist and is presently serving as Chief of the A Guidance Center, N. C. State College, Raleigh, charged with the Guidance program in the Rehabilitation of disabled veterans. He served the Church in Washington and California before entering the chaplaincy.—F. L. F.]

REHABILITATION can be described in a modern way as an approach to abundant life. The organizations interested in one phase or another of this tremendous task are myriad in number.

It is fully recognized that "Everyman" has need and his need must be met. He is subject to ills and they must be cured. He is subject to temptations and these must be removed. He can be helped, be educated, inspired and directed.

Religion through the instrumentality of the organized church has inspired, approved and blessed many movements, bent in lending a helping hand, sending them on their way like so many children and hoping for the best.

The church has reserved for itself the phase of spiritual rehabilitation and has shown only a passing interest in "Everyman's" total welfare. The rise of the social emphasis has changed this point of emphasis and there is a growing concern for complete rehabilitation.

The minister of the local parish has long ago ceased being the oracle of authority on local or community problems. He speaks from the pulpit and the rostrum with an authority which has grown out of his understanding of peoples and their individual and corporate problems.

The emphasis which has been placed upon pastoral counseling, the care of the sick, the understanding of problems of parishioners and nonparishioners indicates a trend which has been long overdue.

The instruments which are available to assist in this work of the church have been perfected and enlarged until today we can say without hesitation that they begin to fill a need.

Religion's real job is with the rehabilitation of "Everyman." The minister can no longer operate as if he were only concerned with the religious side of life. It is the unusual person who can do much with "religion, politics, or art" unless he has food to eat and clothing for the body and a reasonable amount of social adjustment. I am saying that salvation for "Everyman" includes religious, social, economic and educational wholeness. Whether men's ills are mental or physical they are nonetheless real and a gnawing pain to be relieved. His social maladjustments are frustrations which must be solved. His economic adversities must be adjusted before he can become stabilized.

To cope with the needs of "Everyman" the minister must become a clinical specialist. One who in living with his people, understands them and can channel his knowledge and capabilities through techniques and instruments at hand so that wholeness can be realized.

In a sense a minister becomes a diagnostician in a limited sense, able to recognize symptoms for what they are. Symp-

toms are behavior patterns, the results of more deep-seated maladies whether of mind, body or soul.

In another sense he becomes an expert in guidance which is the art of helping people to help themselves.

Probably one of the weakest spots in the counseling armor is the minister's use or misuse of the interview. Fortunate was the man of early training who stumbled upon an effective technique. Certainly formal training in theological circles has been at a minimum. A small number of men at college centers found it necessary to equip themselves with the technique of the interview to cope with the problems among their parishioners. There are varieties of these techniques—one used in social case work, another in vocational advisement, another used by the medical profession.

I am not overlooking the fact that the preaching of The Word is an all-important task of the minister. I am saying that to hide behind the curtain of this obligation and to inadequately perform his real function as a pastor is a denial of his real task.

The satisfactory utilization of the interview and the best available techniques is very important. One must be able to so utilize the interview that without being obnoxious he can clear the atmosphere of rubbish and get to the root of the problem.

Other measuring devices are available which should be understood and their interpretation should be mastered. In problem cases these can be used along with interviews by those who have become qualified to administer, score and interpret results. I refer to personality inventories which often help nail down a problem so that it can be observed and discussed more objectively.

I would like to see every graduate of our theological schools at least exposed to a course in Tests and Measurements in order that he may shake hands with interest patterns, general mental-ability tests, personality inventories, trade questions and aptitude tests. He will not become an expert but he will recognize the tools used by the psychologist in measuring mental achievement.

I deal daily with men who are in need of rehabilitation because of injury or disease as the result of their war experience. It is necessary to recognize their limitations, to evaluate present potentialities, to gauge motivation or determination, to measure abilities. This needs doing ' help these men square away in life. Th most disturbing are the men who have mental disabilities. This is probably on of the largest groups of war casualtie To help fit these men back into norma situations in the community becomes the responsibility of the men and women entrusted with positions of leadership.

Rehabilitation you will recognize as a new term with old significance. For what is salvation if it is not saving man in his wholeness?

It is thus that religion functions in society, taking strides towards the ultimate, and leaving its footprints on the sands of time. The shape of things to come is influenced by things as they are. The church has today in its hands.